

On Jordan algebras and multialgebras of symmetric matrices

Yury Grabovsky

October 2, 2012

Abstract

Jordan *multialgebras* of symmetric matrices are subspaces of the space of symmetric matrices which are closed with respect to *several* special Jordan multiplications. They arise in a model of composite materials as diffeomorphic images of exact relations—relations between the components of the effective tensors that hold regardless of composite’s microstructure. The fundamental question of the theory of exact relations is whether every special Jordan multialgebra corresponds to an exact relation. This question is related to a generalization of a classical problem in the theory of special Jordan algebras about all possible product identities. A particular class of these identities, called the 4-chain relations do not hold in general for classical special Jordan algebras. However, there is a mounting empirical evidence that they do hold for rotationally invariant Jordan multialgebras coming from physics. In order to resolve the apparent contradiction between theory and examples we give a complete characterization of all Jordan subalgebras of real symmetric matrices. We show that the failure of the 4-chain relations occurs only in exceptional cases, giving a plausible explanation of the prevalence of 4-chain identities in low-dimensional examples from the theory of exact relations, which is briefly reviewed in this paper.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	3
3	The structure of Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$	5
3.1	Properties of formally real Jordan algebras	5
3.2	The non-singular Jordan algebras	7
3.3	Splitting of Jordan algebras	7
3.4	Irreducible Jordan algebras	9

4	The characterization of irreducible Jordan algebras	10
4.1	Block decomposition	11
4.2	Structure of $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$ -blocks	11
4.3	Block interaction	14
5	Jordan automorphisms	17
5.1	Automorphism of Π_*	17
5.2	Automorphisms of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$, $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ and $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$	18
6	Conclusions	21
6.1	Structure theorem	22
6.2	Completeness	22
6.3	Symmetric subalgebras of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$	23
6.4	Completeness of multialgebras	23
7	Acknowledgement	24
A	Theory of exact relations for effective tensors of composite materials	24
B	$SO(3)$ invariant Jordan multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$	26
C	Incomplete $SO(2)$-invariant Jordan multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$	28

1 Introduction

While the subject of this paper is purely algebraic, the specific questions raised here come from applied mathematics, specifically from the modelling of composite materials [2, 16, 27]. The study of effective behavior of composite materials abounds with beautiful formulas linking the components of the effective tensor and the tensor of material properties of its constituent materials when virtually nothing is known about the microstructure of the composite [14, 18, 21, 28, 12, 32, 23, 24, 6, 7, 5, 3, 4, 22] (see also a fairly complete list in [11] and a review by Milton [26]). According to the general theory of these identities [8, 11, 9] (see Appendix A), each microstructure-independent relation corresponds to a novel algebraic object that we call *special Jordan multialgebra*—a subspace of the space of symmetric matrices closed with respect to several Jordan multiplications. The fundamental problem of the theory of exact relations is whether every special Jordan multialgebra corresponds to an exact relation. In algebraic terms the Jordan multialgebra corresponds to an exact relation if it is equal to the set of all symmetric matrices in the smallest associative multialgebra containing it. We call such algebras *complete*. The explicit characterization of all Jordan subalgebras of real symmetric matrices, which is the main result of this paper, shows that only exceptional simple algebras fail to be complete. Requiring the algebra to be closed with respect to several multiplications makes the examples of incomplete simple algebras even more rare.

Physically relevant examples of Jordan multialgebras possess additional structure of a representation space of $SO(2)$ or $SO(3)$ (2D and 3D microgeometries). The interaction between the representation structure and the multiplicative structure of the algebra has been studied in a series of papers [29, 31, 30, 19] inspired by the same theory of exact relations. In Appendix C we use the main result of this paper to give examples of incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras in the physically relevant context of several coupled gradient fields [24, 23]. We conjecture that $SO(3)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras, at least those arising in physics are always complete (see Conjecture 2.3 below). This conjecture is supported by several physically important examples [11].

The question of completeness is related to Morrey's conjecture in analysis, asking whether rank-1 convexity is equivalent to quasiconvexity. While Šverák's counterexample [33] shows that the two notions are different in general, the question of whether the same is true for frame-indifferent functions is still open. A related question in the context of composite materials was settled by Milton [27, Section 39.9], but the same question for 3D polycrystals, and in particular for polycrystalline exact relations that we deal with in this paper, is also open. The examples of incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras Appendix C may lead to counterexamples to the Morrey conjecture in the case of 2D polycrystalline exact relations.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the algebraic problem arising in the mathematical modeling of composite materials and state our conjecture. In Section 3 we describe the structure of an arbitrary Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in terms of simple algebras and simple algebras in terms of irreducible algebras. In Section 4 we characterize all irreducible subalgebras. Section 5 we describe the automorphism of the irreducible algebras that are needed to build a simple algebra out of an irreducible one. In Section 6 we put all the results together and discuss the question of completeness of arbitrary Jordan subalgebras and multialgebras. The general theory of exact relations is summarized in Appendix A for the convenience of the reader. Appendix B reviews an example from [11] for which our conjecture is settled in the affirmative. Appendix C gives general equations for $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras in the context of several coupled gradient fields and exhibits several examples of incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we formulate the algebraic problem that arises in applications, namely, the theory of composite materials. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a real finite dimensional representation of $SO(3)$. The irreducible representations (irreps) are parametrized by non-negative integers, called weights. In the theory of composite materials, where one is interested in coupled thermal, electric and elastic properties of materials, the space $\mathcal{T}$ can contain only the irreps of weights 0, 1 and 2. The weight 0 irrep W_0 is a 1-dimensional space with trivial group action. The weight 1 irrep W_1 is $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the natural action of $SO(3)$, while the weight 2 irrep W_2 is the space $\text{Sym}_0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of symmetric trace-free 3×3 matrices with $SO(3)$ acting by conjugation

$A \mapsto RAR^{-1}$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{T} = W_0 \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_0} \oplus W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \oplus W_2 \otimes \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \quad n_0 \geq 0, n_1 \geq 0, n_2 \geq 0 \quad (2.1)$$

is the most general representation encountered in the theory of composite materials. The notation in (2.1) emphasizes that the group acts trivially on the second factors in tensor products above. We assume that the representation $\mathcal{T}$ is equipped with a fixed $SO(3)$ -invariant inner product. The space $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ of symmetric maps on $\mathcal{T}$ has a natural action of $SO(3)$ and splits into the direct sum of irreps up to weight 4. In addition to the representation $\mathcal{T}$ the algebraic structure of our problem is determined by the choice of a subrepresentation $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$, which must be isomorphic to $W_2 \oplus W_4$ as an $SO(3)$ module (or only W_2 , if $n_2 = 0$).

Definition 2.1. *A rotationally invariant **Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra** is a subrepresentation Π of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ closed with respect to Jordan multiplications*

$$K_1 *_A K_2 = \frac{1}{2}(K_1 AK_2 + K_2 AK_1), \quad \{K_1, K_2\} \subset \Pi, \quad A \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (2.2)$$

*A subrepresentation $\Pi' \subset \text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ closed with respect to the multiplications $(K_1, K_2) \mapsto K_1 AK_2$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is called an **associative $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra**.*

Let $\mathfrak{A}(\Pi)$ to be the smallest associative $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra containing Π . For any subspace $V \subset \text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ that satisfies $V^T = V$ we define

$$V_{\text{sym}} = V \bigcap \text{Sym}(\mathcal{T}) = \{A + A^T : A \in V\}.$$

Definition 2.2. *A Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra Π is called **complete** if*

$$\mathfrak{A}(\Pi)_{\text{sym}} = \Pi. \quad (2.3)$$

Otherwise, we will say that Π is incomplete.

According to the general theory [8, 11, 9, 27] (see Appendix A) the Jordan multialgebra Π corresponds to an exact relation for composite materials if it is complete. It is easy to show that Π is complete if and only if 3 and 4-chain identities

$$K_1 A_1 K_2 A_2 K_3 + K_3 A_2 K_2 A_1 K_1 \in \Pi, \quad K_1 A_1 K_2 A_2 K_3 A_3 K_4 + K_4 A_3 K_3 A_2 K_2 A_1 K_1 \in \Pi \quad (2.4)$$

hold for all $\{K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4\} \subset \Pi$ and all $\{A_1, A_2, A_3\} \subset \mathcal{A}$. The proof is a straightforward modification of the proof of Cohn's theorem [15, p. 8]. We remark that in the case of classical Jordan algebras (one-dimensional subspace $\mathcal{A}$) the 3-chain relations hold automatically.

Conjecture 2.3. *Assume that $\mathcal{T}$ is given by (2.1) and $\mathcal{A} \subset \text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ is isomorphic to $W_2 \oplus W_4$ as an $SO(3)$ module. We conjecture that any rotationally invariant $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra is complete.*

The rationale behind this conjecture is a positive result established in [11] (see also Appendix B), when $n_0 = n_2 = 0$ and $\mathcal{A} = W_2 \otimes \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_{n_1}$, where $\mathbf{I}_n$ denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix. The analogous result for $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras does not hold (see the counterexamples in Appendix C). We have also computed a complete list of Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras for $n_0 = n_1 = n_2 = 1$ in [11]. The veracity of the conjecture was verified by hand for each Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra.

While the existing empirical evidence points in favor of our conjecture, the established understanding for classical Jordan algebras points against it. One of the first examples in the Jacobson's book on Jordan algebras [15] shows that Jordan algebras do not have to be complete in general. In order to resolve this apparent contradiction between theory and practice we obtain a complete characterization, up to orthogonal conjugation, of all Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, i.e. subspaces $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, which are closed with respect to the Jordan product

$$A * B = \frac{1}{2}(AB + BA). \quad (2.5)$$

The explicit characterization, obtained in this paper reveals that completeness can indeed fail, but only in a few exceptional cases. Adding more multiplications with respect to which the algebras have to be closed makes these cases even more exceptional, so that in the relatively low dimensional cases completeness is generic. The analysis of how the addition of $SO(3)$ -invariance can eliminate the exceptions altogether, as in Appendix B is beyond the scope of this paper.

3 The structure of Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

3.1 Properties of formally real Jordan algebras

Before we begin our analysis we must mention the complete classification of all formally real Jordan algebras¹ by Jordan, von Neumann and Wigner in [17], since clearly, all subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are formally real. However, our goal of classifying all Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is different. Moreover, the question of completeness for a subalgebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ depends not only on the isomorphism class of Π , but on the specific embedding of $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. In fact, our results will produce an example of two different faithful representations of the same algebra in $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, one of which is complete, while the other is not.

Even though the final classification of all formally real Jordan algebras in [17] cannot be used directly, the intermediate results in that paper are immediately applicable to our problem. Here we summarize the results from [17] that we will need below, for the convenience of the reader. The first set of statements refers to an arbitrary formally real Jordan algebra.

THEOREM 3.1 (Jordan, von Neumann, Wigner).

¹An algebra Π is called a Jordan algebra, if it is commutative, non-associative algebra in which $A^n * A^m = A^{m+n}$ for all non-negative integers m and n . It is called formally real if the sum of squares of any number of elements of Π can be zero only if all of the elements are zero.

- (a) There is a unique element $\mathbb{I}_\Pi \in \Pi$ such that $\mathbb{I}_\Pi * A = A$ for all $A \in \Pi$.
- (b) The subalgebra $\langle \mathbb{I}_\Pi, A \rangle$ generated by $A \in \Pi$ and $\mathbb{I}_\Pi$ contains pairwise orthogonal non-zero idempotents² $E_1, \dots, E_s$ such that

$$E_1 + \dots + E_s = \mathbb{I}_\Pi, \quad \lambda_1 E_1 + \dots + \lambda_s E_s = A \quad (3.1)$$

for some $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

- (c) An idempotent is called *unresolvable*, if it cannot be written as a sum of two orthogonal non-zero idempotents. There exist unresolvable, pairwise orthogonal idempotents $E_1, \dots, E_r$ such that

$$E_1 + \dots + E_r = \mathbb{I}_\Pi. \quad (3.2)$$

The resolution of unity (3.2) is not unique but the number r of unresolvable pairwise orthogonal idempotents in it is always the same.

- (d) If $\mathcal{A} \subset \Pi$ is a proper ideal then $\Pi = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}$ as a direct sum of algebras, where $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \Pi : A * B = 0, \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is the complementary ideal.
- (e) Any algebra Π is a direct (orthogonal) sum of simple algebras

$$\Pi = \Pi_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \Pi_m, \quad (3.3)$$

where each component Π_j is identified with a minimal proper ideal in Π .

The second set of results refers to a simple formally real Jordan algebra Π , in which the decomposition of unity (3.2) is chosen. Let

$$\mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma} = \left\{ A \in \Pi : E_\tau * A = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\rho\tau} + \delta_{\sigma\tau})A \text{ for all } \tau = 1, \dots, r \right\}, \quad \rho, \sigma = 1, \dots, r.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma} = \mathcal{M}^{\sigma\rho}$.

THEOREM 3.2 (Jordan, von Neumann, Wigner).

- (a) $\Pi = \bigoplus_{1 \leq \rho \leq \sigma \leq r} \mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma}$, as a direct sum of vector spaces.
- (b) $\dim \mathcal{M}^{\sigma\sigma} = 1$, $\dim \mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma} = p$, independent of σ and ρ , as long as $\sigma \neq \rho$.
- (c) The spaces $\mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma}$ have bases $\{X_1^{\rho\sigma}, \dots, X_p^{\rho\sigma}\}$ such that

$$X_\mu^{\rho\sigma} * X_\nu^{\rho\sigma} = \delta_{\mu\nu}(E_\rho + E_\sigma), \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, p, \quad 1 \leq \rho < \sigma \leq r.$$

²i.e. $E_\nu * E_\sigma = \delta_{\nu\sigma} E_\nu$

3.2 The non-singular Jordan algebras

From now on Π refers to a subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, i.e. a subspace closed with respect to the multiplication (2.5). Let

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^n : Au = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \Pi\}.$$

Then, in the basis which is the union of the bases for $V = \mathcal{N}(\Pi)^\perp$ and $\mathcal{N}(\Pi)$

$$\Pi = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : A \in \Pi_0 \subset \text{Sym}(V) \right\}, \quad (3.4)$$

where Π_0 is a Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(V)$, for which $\mathcal{N}(\Pi_0) = \{0\}$.

Definition 3.3. We say that the Jordan algebra Π is **non-singular** if

$$\mathcal{N}(\Pi) = \{0\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Any algebra Π is non-singular on $V = \mathcal{N}(\Pi)^\perp$. Hence, without loss of generality, we may assume that Π is non-singular.

Lemma 3.4. Suppose that the Jordan algebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is non-singular. Then, $\mathbf{I}_n \in \Pi$, where $\mathbf{I}_n$ is the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1 there exists the algebra identity $\mathbb{I}_\Pi \in \Pi$. Then $\mathbb{I}_\Pi^2 = \mathbb{I}_\Pi$. Therefore, the symmetric matrix $\mathbb{I}_\Pi$ may have eigenvalues that are either 1 or 0. Suppose $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an eigenvector of $\mathbb{I}_\Pi$ with eigenvalue zero. Then, by assumption, there exists $A \in \Pi$, such that $v = Au \neq 0$. Applying the equality $2A = A\mathbb{I}_\Pi + \mathbb{I}_\Pi A$ to the vector u we obtain $2v = \mathbb{I}_\Pi v$. This contradicts the fact that 2 is not an eigenvalue for $\mathbb{I}_\Pi$. Thus, $\mathbb{I}_\Pi$ may not have an eigenvalue 0. Therefore, $\mathbb{I}_\Pi = \mathbf{I}_n$. $\square$

Let $A \in \Pi$. Suppose that its eigenvalues are $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and the corresponding eigenspaces are V_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, s$. By Theorem 3.1 the idempotents E_α in (3.1) must be orthogonal projections P_{V_α} onto the eigenspaces V_α of A . We will call them spectral projections. Thus, for any $A \in \Pi$ all of its spectral projections P_{V_α} must also be in Π , and

$$A = \sum_{\alpha=1}^s \lambda_\alpha P_{V_\alpha}, \quad V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_s = \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (3.6)$$

3.3 Splitting of Jordan algebras

Definition 3.5. We say that the Jordan algebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ **splits** over the orthogonal decomposition $\mathbb{R}^n = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_m$, if $\Pi = \Pi_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \Pi_m$, is a direct sum of Jordan algebras, where

$$\Pi_\alpha = \{A \in \Pi : Aw = 0 \text{ for all } w \in V_\alpha^\perp\}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, m.$$

If Π splits over $\mathbb{R}^n = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_m$, then in the basis, which is the union of bases for V_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$ the algebra Π has the form

$$\Pi = \{\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m) : A_\alpha \in \Pi_\alpha^0 \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha), \alpha = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

In other words all matrices in Π have block-diagonal structure, with independent blocks A_α taken from subalgebras $\Pi_\alpha^0 \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha)$ that are isomorphic to Π_α . Clearly, each $\Pi_\alpha \subset \Pi$ is an ideal. Conversely, if $\mathcal{A} \subset \Pi$ is an ideal, then, according to Theorem 3.1, there exists a complementary ideal

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \Pi : A * B = 0 \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}\},$$

such that $\Pi = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}$, as a direct sum of algebras.

LEMMA 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be the complementary pair of ideals in Π . Then there exists $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\Pi = \mathcal{A} \oplus \mathcal{B}$ is the splitting of Π over $\mathbb{R}^n = V \oplus V^\perp$.*

Proof. Let $V = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B})$. The subspace V cannot be all of $\mathbb{R}^n$, since otherwise $\mathcal{B} = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \Pi$. If $V = \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{B}$ is a non-singular algebra and $\mathbf{I}_n \in \mathcal{B}$, by Lemma 3.4. But then $\mathcal{B} = \Pi$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$. The subspace $V^\perp$ is invariant for $\mathcal{B}$, since all matrices in $\mathcal{B}$ are symmetric. Thus, $\mathcal{B}$ is isomorphic to a subalgebra $\mathcal{B}_0$ of $\text{Sym}(V^\perp)$ defined by the restriction of $\mathcal{B}$ on $V^\perp$. By our construction $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{B}_0) = \{0\}$ and, applying Lemma 3.4 to $\mathcal{B}_0$ we conclude that $P_{V^\perp} \in \mathcal{B}$. Now, let $B \in \Pi$ be such that $Bv = 0$ for all $v \in V$. Then $P_{V^\perp} * B = B$. Thus, $B \in \mathcal{B}$, since $\mathcal{B}$ is an ideal. We have now proved that $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \Pi : Bv = 0 \text{ for all } v \in V\}$. To finish the proof of the lemma we need to show that $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A}) = V^\perp$. First we observe that V (and therefore $V^\perp$) is an invariant subspace for $\mathcal{A}$. Indeed, for any $v \in V$ and any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$P_{V^\perp}(Av) = 2(P_{V^\perp} * A)v - A(P_{V^\perp}v) = 0,$$

since $P_{V^\perp} \in \mathcal{B}$. Also, for any $w \in V^\perp$ and any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$Aw = P_{V^\perp}(Aw) = 2(P_{V^\perp} * A)w - A(P_{V^\perp}w) = -Aw.$$

Thus, $V^\perp \subset \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{A})$. To prove the reverse inclusion we observe that $P_V * B = 0$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Indeed, $B * P_{V^\perp} = B$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, therefore $B * P_V = B * (\mathbf{I}_n - P_{V^\perp}) = B - B = 0$. It follows that $P_V \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus, if $Ax = 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, then $P_V x = 0$ and $x \in V^\perp$. $\square$

Corollary 3.7. *Let (3.3) be the decomposition of Π into a direct sum of simple algebras. Then, there exist pairwise orthogonal subspaces $V_1, \dots, V_m$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that (3.3) is the splitting of Π over the orthogonal decomposition $\mathbb{R}^n = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_m$. Thus,*

$$\Pi = \{\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m) : A_\alpha \in \Pi_\alpha \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha), \alpha = 1, \dots, m\}, \quad (3.7)$$

where $\Pi_\alpha \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$ are simple Jordan algebras.

3.4 Irreducible Jordan algebras

According to Corollary 3.7 we need to understand the structure of simple non-singular Jordan algebras $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. As in the theory of associative algebras it is important whether or not there is a common invariant subspace for all matrices $A \in \Pi$. Any Jordan algebra is completely reducible in the sense that there exists an orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathbb{R}^n = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_k,$$

such that all subspaces V_α are invariant for all matrices $A \in \Pi$ and they do not contain any smaller proper invariant subspaces for Π .

Definition 3.8. A Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is called *irreducible* if it does not have any proper invariant subspaces in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We remark that the irreducibility is not a property of the Jordan algebra itself, but rather of the specific embedding of that algebra in $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Our goal is to describe the structure of an arbitrary simple non-singular subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in terms of irreducible algebras.

LEMMA 3.9. Let Π be a simple non-singular subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathbb{R}^n = V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_k$ be an orthogonal decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^n$ into the sum of irreducible invariant subspaces. Let

$$\Pi_\alpha = \{P_{V_\alpha} A P_{V_\alpha} : A \in \Pi\} \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha), \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, k.$$

Then $\Pi_\alpha \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, k$ are irreducible Jordan algebras in the sense of Definition 3.8. Moreover, the maps $T_{\alpha\beta} : \Pi_\alpha \rightarrow \Pi_\beta$ defined as

$$T_{\alpha\beta} A = P_{V_\beta} K P_{V_\beta}, \quad A = P_{V_\alpha} K P_{V_\alpha}, \quad K \in \Pi$$

are Jordan algebra isomorphisms.

Proof. Let $A \in \Pi_\alpha$ and suppose $\{K_1, K_2\} \subset \Pi$ are such that $A = P_{V_\alpha} K_1 P_{V_\alpha} = P_{V_\alpha} K_2 P_{V_\alpha}$. Then $P_{V_\alpha}(K_1 - K_2)P_{V_\alpha} = 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \{K \in \Pi : P_{V_\alpha} K P_{V_\alpha} = 0\}.$$

Let us show that $\mathcal{A}$ is an ideal in Π . Let $X \in \Pi$ and $K \in \mathcal{A}$ be arbitrary. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have $x = v + w$, where $v \in V_\alpha$ and $w \in V_\alpha^\perp$. Obviously $P_{V_\alpha}(X * K)P_{V_\alpha} w = 0$. We also have

$$2P_{V_\alpha}(X * K)P_{V_\alpha} v = P_{V_\alpha} K X v,$$

since $Kv = 0$ for any $v \in V_\alpha$. But $Xv \in V_\alpha$, since V_α is an invariant subspace for Π , and thus, $KXv = 0$. It follows that $X * K \in \mathcal{A}$. The ideal $\mathcal{A}$ cannot be Π , since in that case $V_\alpha \subset \mathcal{N}(\Pi)$, contrary to the assumption that Π is a non-singular algebra. Hence, $\mathcal{A} = \{0\}$. Hence, for any $A \in \Pi_\alpha$ there is a unique $K \in \Pi$ for which $A = P_{V_\alpha} K P_{V_\alpha}$. Moreover, for any $\{K_1, K_2\} \subset \Pi$ we have

$$(P_{V_\alpha} K_1 P_{V_\alpha}) * (P_{V_\alpha} K_2 P_{V_\alpha}) = P_{V_\alpha} (K_1 * K_2) P_{V_\alpha}.$$

Indeed, the invariance of V_α implies that for any $v \in V_\alpha$

$$P_{V_\alpha} K_1 P_{V_\alpha} P_{V_\alpha} K_2 v = P_{V_\alpha} K_1 K_2 v = K_1 K_2 v.$$

It follows that $\Pi_\alpha \subset \text{Sym}(V_\alpha)$ are irreducible Jordan algebras. The maps $T_{\alpha\beta}$ are well-defined and preserve Jordan multiplication

$$T_{\alpha\beta}(A_1 * A_2) = P_{V_\beta}(K_1 * K_2)P_{V_\beta} = (P_{V_\beta} K_1 P_{V_\beta}) * (P_{V_\beta} K_2 P_{V_\beta}) = (T_{\alpha\beta} A_1) * (T_{\alpha\beta} A_2).$$

By construction, the maps $T_{\alpha\beta}$ are surjective. Let us show that they are also injective. If $A \in \Pi_\alpha$ and $A \neq 0$, then there is a unique $K \in \Pi$ such that $A = P_{V_\alpha} K P_{V_\alpha}$. Clearly, $K \neq 0$. If $T_{\alpha\beta} A = P_{V_\beta} K P_{V_\beta} = 0$, then $K' = 0$ and $K \neq K'$ satisfy $P_{V_\beta} K P_{V_\beta} = P_{V_\beta} K' P_{V_\beta}$ in contradiction of uniqueness. $\square$

Hence, we have proved the structure theorem for simple non-singular Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a non-singular simple Jordan algebra. Then there exists an orthonormal basis (o.n.b.) of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in which the algebra Π has the form*

$$\Pi = \{\text{diag}(A, T_1 A, \dots, T_{k-1} A) : A \in \Pi_0 \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^N)\}, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\Pi_0 \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is an irreducible Jordan algebra and $T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}$ are Jordan algebra isomorphisms.

Thus, we have reduced the problem of description of all subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the problem of characterization of all irreducible Jordan algebras and their isomorphisms.

The problem of completeness of Π can also be restated. It is now clear that for a Jordan algebra to be complete in the sense of Definition 2.2 it is necessary and sufficient for each of its simple components Π_α , to be complete. The latter condition will be satisfied if and only if the irreducible algebras Π_0 and $\Pi_\alpha = T_\alpha \Pi_0$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, k-1$, in the representation (3.8) are complete and Jordan isomorphisms T_α satisfy

$$T_\alpha(A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 + A_4 A_3 A_2 A_1) = T_\alpha A_1 T_\alpha A_2 T_\alpha A_3 T_\alpha A_4 + T_\alpha A_4 T_\alpha A_3 T_\alpha A_2 T_\alpha A_1. \quad (3.9)$$

4 The characterization of irreducible Jordan algebras

To complete the characterization of all Jordan subalgebras $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we need to describe all irreducible Jordan algebras up to an orthogonal equivalence and compute their Jordan isomorphisms. In this section we take on the former problem.

4.1 Block decomposition

According to Theorem 3.2 there exist an orthogonal decomposition $\mathbb{R}^n = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_r$, such that the algebra Π can be represented as a direct sum $\Pi = \bigoplus_{1 \leq \rho \leq \sigma \leq r} \mathcal{M}^{\rho\sigma}$ (block decomposition), where

$$\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\alpha} = \mathbb{R}P_{W_\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 1, \dots, r,$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta} = \{P_{W_\alpha}AP_{W_\beta} + P_{W_\beta}AP_{W_\alpha} : A \in \Pi\}, \quad 1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq r.$$

The spaces $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$ have the same dimension p for all $1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq r$ and have the basis

$$X_\mu^{\alpha\beta} = P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta} + P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha}$$

such that

$$X_\mu^{\alpha\beta} * X_\nu^{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{\mu\nu}(P_{W_\alpha} + P_{W_\beta}), \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, p.$$

In particular,

$$(X_\mu^{\alpha\beta})^2 = P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha} + P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta} = P_{W_\alpha} + P_{W_\beta}.$$

It follows that

$$P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha} = P_{W_\alpha}, \quad P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta} = P_{W_\beta}.$$

From the first equality we obtain that

$$\dim(W_\alpha) = \text{rank}(P_{W_\alpha}) = \text{rank}(P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha}) \leq \dim(W_\beta),$$

while from the second one we obtain

$$\dim(W_\beta) = \text{rank}(P_{W_\beta}) = \text{rank}(P_{W_\beta}A_\mu P_{W_\alpha}A_\mu P_{W_\beta}) \leq \dim(W_\alpha).$$

Thus, $\dim(W_\alpha) = d = n/r$ for all $\alpha = 1, \dots, r$.

4.2 Structure of $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$ -blocks

In order to continue, it will be convenient to fix arbitrary orthonormal bases for spaces W_α and work with $d \times d$ matrices X representing the $\alpha\beta$ -block of $P_{W_\alpha}AP_{W_\beta}$. Part (c) of Theorem 3.2 asserts that the space $\mathcal{U}$ of $d \times d$ matrices representing the $\alpha\beta$ -block of $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$, $\alpha < \beta$ has the basis $X_1, \dots, X_p$ such that

$$X_\mu X_\mu^T = \mathbf{I}_d, \quad X_\mu X_\nu^T + X_\nu X_\mu^T = 0, \quad \mu \neq \nu.$$

It follows that $\{X_1, \dots, X_p\} \subset O(d)$. Let $Y_\mu = X_\mu X_1^T$, $\mu = 1, \dots, p$. Then $Y_1 = \mathbf{I}_d$ and

$$Y_\mu Y_\mu^T = \mathbf{I}_d, \quad Y_\mu + Y_\mu^T = 0, \quad Y_\mu Y_\nu^T + Y_\nu Y_\mu^T = 0, \quad 2 \leq \mu < \nu \leq p.$$

In particular $Y_\mu^2 = -\mathbf{I}_d$, $\mu = 2, \dots, p$. Thus, if $p > 1$, it follows that p is even and all Y_μ , $\mu = 2, \dots, p$ have exactly two eigenvalues $\pm i$. By a choice of the o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^d$ we may represent Y_2 as a block-diagonal matrix with identical 2×2 blocks

$$Y_2 = \text{diag}(S, \dots, S) = S \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/2}, \quad S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.1)$$

If $p > 2$ then Y_3 must satisfy

$$Y_3^T = -Y_3, \quad Y_3^2 = -\mathbf{I}_d, \quad Y_3 Y_2 = -Y_2 Y_3.$$

Before we determine the explicit form of Y_3 , let us assume that $p > 3$. Then Y_4 satisfies

$$Y_4^T = -Y_4, \quad Y_4^2 = -\mathbf{I}_d, \quad Y_4 Y_2 = -Y_2 Y_4, \quad Y_4 Y_3 = -Y_3 Y_4.$$

Then the matrix $Z = Y_3 Y_4$ has the properties:

$$Z^2 = -\mathbf{I}_d, \quad Z^T Z = \mathbf{I}_d, \quad Z Y_2 = Y_2 Z.$$

The last relation implies that the two complex eigenspaces of Y_2 are invariant with respect to Z , while Z has exactly two invariant subspaces in $\mathbb{C}^d$, each of complex dimension $d/2$. The eigenvalues of Z are also $\pm i$. We conclude that $Z = \pm Y_2$. In particular, $Y_4 = \pm Y_2 Y_3$. The same argument would apply to any Y_μ , $\mu > 3$. Thus, $p \leq 4$. It remains to identify the matrix Y_3 .

If we represent Y_3 as the block-matrix $y_{\rho\sigma}$, where $y_{\rho\sigma}$ are 2×2 blocks, then the defining property of Y_3 becomes $y_{\sigma\rho}^T = -y_{\rho\sigma}$ and $y_{\rho\sigma} S = -S y_{\rho\sigma}$. It follows that $y_{\rho\rho} = 0$ and

$$y_{\rho\sigma} = \psi(a_{\rho\sigma} + i b_{\rho\sigma}) = \begin{bmatrix} a_{\rho\sigma} & b_{\rho\sigma} \\ b_{\rho\sigma} & -a_{\rho\sigma} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \rho < k.$$

for some real numbers $a_{\rho\sigma}, b_{\rho\sigma}$. Thus, the matrix Y_3 can be described by a $d/2 \times d/2$ complex matrix M , such that $y_{\rho\sigma} = \psi(m_{\rho\sigma})$. The equations

$$Y_3^T = -Y_3, \quad Y_3^2 = -\mathbf{I}_d, \quad Y_3 Y_2 = -Y_2 Y_3. \quad (4.2)$$

imply that

$$M^* M = \mathbf{I}_{d/2}, \quad M^* = -\overline{M}.$$

Taking determinant of the first and second identity we get a contradiction, unless $d/2$ is even.

Now we observe that we still have some freedom in choosing the o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^d$ in such a way that Y_2 is still given by (4.1). For that purpose we can use only those orthogonal transformations R that have the property $R Y_2 R^T = Y_2$. Writing R as $d/2 \times d/2$ block matrix with 2×2 blocks $r_{\rho\sigma}$ we find that $r_{\rho\sigma} = \varphi(c_{\rho\sigma})$ for some $c_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence, we identify such rotation matrices R with complex $d/2 \times d/2$ matrices $C \in U(d/2)$. If Y_3 satisfies (4.2) and $R \in O(d)$ is such that $R Y_2 R^T = Y_2$, then the transformed matrix $Y'_3 = R Y_3 R^T$ also satisfies

the same set of equations. This matrix has 2×2 blocks $\psi(m'_{\rho\sigma})$, where $M' = CMC^T$, $C \in U(d/2)$. Observe that if $u \in \mathbb{C}^{d/2}$ is an eigenvector of M , i.e. $Mu = \lambda u$ then

$$u = \lambda M^* u = -\lambda \overline{M} u \quad \Rightarrow \quad M \overline{u} = -\frac{\overline{u}}{\lambda} = -\lambda \overline{u},$$

since $|\lambda| = 1$. In particular, the eigenvalues λ and $-\lambda$ are distinct and hence vectors u and $\overline{u}$ are orthogonal in $\mathbb{C}^{d/2}$. Thus all eigenvalues and eigenvectors of M split into pairs $u_1, \overline{u}_1, \dots, u_{d/4}, \overline{u}_{d/4}$. Let $C \in U(d/2)$ be such that

$$C^T e_1 = u_1, \quad C^T e_2 = \overline{u}_1, \quad \dots \quad C^T e_{d/2-1} = u_{d/4}, \quad C^T e_{d/2} = \overline{u}_{d/4}.$$

Then the matrix $M' = CMC^T$ will have components

$$M'_{\rho\sigma} = (CMC^T e_\sigma, e_\rho) = (MC^T e_\sigma, \overline{C^T e_\rho}).$$

Consider 4 possibilities. If σ and ρ are even, then

$$M'_{\rho\sigma} = (M \overline{u_{\sigma/2}}, u_{\rho/2}) = -\lambda_{\sigma/2}(\overline{u_{\sigma/2}}, u_{\rho/2}) = 0$$

If σ and ρ are odd then

$$M'_{\rho\sigma} = (Mu_{(\sigma+1)/2}, \overline{u_{(\rho+1)/2}}) = \lambda_{(\sigma+1)/2}(u_{(\sigma+1)/2}, \overline{u_{(\rho+1)/2}}) = 0.$$

If σ is even and ρ is odd then

$$M'_{\rho\sigma} = (M \overline{u_{\sigma/2}}, \overline{u_{(\rho+1)/2}}) = -\lambda_{\sigma/2}(\overline{u_{\sigma/2}}, \overline{u_{(\rho+1)/2}}) = -\lambda_{\sigma/2} \delta_{\sigma, \rho+1}.$$

If σ is odd and ρ is even then

$$M'_{\rho\sigma} = (Mu_{(\sigma+1)/2}, u_{\rho/2}) = \lambda_{(\sigma+1)/2}(u_{(\sigma+1)/2}, u_{\rho/2}) = \lambda_{(\sigma+1)/2} \delta_{\sigma+1, \rho}.$$

Hence, M' has a block-diagonal structure

$$\text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_1 \\ \lambda_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_{d/4} \\ \lambda_{d/4} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

where $\lambda_\rho \in \mathbb{C}$, $|\lambda_\rho| = 1$. Now we can take $C \in U(d/2)$ that has the same block-diagonal structure, i.e. $C = \text{diag}(C_1, \dots, C_{d/4})$, where $C_\rho \in U(2)$. A simple calculation shows that

$$C_\rho \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_\rho \\ \lambda_\rho & 0 \end{bmatrix} C_\rho^T = \det(C_\rho) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_\rho \\ \lambda_\rho & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, we can choose the blocks C_ρ such that $\det(C_\rho) = \lambda_\rho^{-1}$. Hence, there is a choice of the o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^d$ so that

$$Y_3 = \text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\psi(1) \\ \psi(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\psi(1) \\ \psi(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\psi(1) \\ \psi(1) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/4}. \quad (4.3)$$

If $p = 4$ then,

$$Y_4 = Y_2 Y_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\psi(i) \\ \psi(i) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/4}.$$

In summary we have the following result. If d is odd we must have $p = 1$ and there exists $R \in O(d)$ such that $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{R}R = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}R$, where $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_d \cong \mathbb{R}$. If d is even but not a multiple of 4, then we may have $p = 1$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}R$, or $p = 2$ and there exists orthogonal matrices $\{R_1, R_2\} \subset O(d)$ such that $\mathcal{U} = R_1 \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}} R_2$, where

$$\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}} = \{\varphi(z) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/2} : z \in \mathbb{C}\} \cong \mathbb{C}.$$

Finally, if d is a multiple of 4, then there are four possibilities. We may have $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}R$, $\mathcal{U} = R_1 \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}} R_2$, $\mathcal{U} = R_1 \mathcal{U}_* R_2$ and $\mathcal{U} = R_1 \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}} R_2$, where

$$\mathcal{U}_* = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(a) & -\psi(\alpha) \\ \psi(\alpha) & \varphi(a) \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/4} : a \in \mathbb{C}, \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(a) & -\psi(b) \\ \psi(b) & \varphi(a) \end{bmatrix} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/4} : \{a, b\} \subset \mathbb{C} \right\} \cong \mathbb{H}.$$

The space $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}}$ can be identified with quaternions. The quaternion $q = q_0 + iq_1 + jq_2 + kq_3$ corresponds to 4×4 matrix $Q(q)$ given in the block-form by

$$Q(q) = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(q_0 + iq_1) & -\psi(q_2 + iq_3) \\ \psi(q_2 + iq_3) & \varphi(q_0 + iq_1) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrices $Q(q)$ have the property that $Q(q)h = qh$, where we identify the quaternion $h = h_0 + ih_1 + jh_2 + kh_3 \in \mathbb{H}$ and $h = [h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3] \in \mathbb{R}^4$. In addition $Q(q)^T = Q(\bar{q})$, where $\bar{q} = q_0 - iq_1 - jq_2 - kq_3$. It is important to note that $q\bar{h} = \bar{h}q$.

4.3 Block interaction

According to Theorem 3.2 all the blocks $\mathcal{M}^{\alpha\beta}$, $\alpha < \beta$ have the same dimension p (that can be either 1, 2, 3 or 4). We have shown in the previous section that there are orthogonal matrices $\{R_{\alpha\beta}, 1 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq r, \alpha \neq \beta\} \subset O(d)$ such that $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta}^T \mathcal{U}_0 R_{\beta\alpha}$, where $\mathcal{U}_0$ is one of the spaces $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}, \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}}, \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}}$ or $\mathcal{U}_*$. If $r = 2$, then we can make a change of the orthonormal bases in W_1 and W_2 with the change of basis matrices R_{12} and R_{21} , respectively, so that $\mathcal{U}_{12} = \mathcal{U}_{21} = \mathcal{U}_0$ in the new basis. The resulting Jordan algebra will be irreducible only if $d/4 = 1$.

Now consider the case $r > 2$. Then for every three mutually distinct indexes α, β and γ we have³

$$R_{\alpha\beta}^T \mathcal{U}_0 R_{\beta\alpha} R_{\beta\gamma}^T \mathcal{U}_0 R_{\gamma\beta} = R_{\alpha\gamma}^T \mathcal{U}_0 R_{\gamma\alpha}. \quad (4.4)$$

³Inclusion of the left-hand side into the right-hand side in (4.4) is replaced by the equality because the dimension of the vector space on the left in (4.4) cannot be smaller than the dimension of the vector space on the right.

Let $T_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = R_{\alpha\beta}R_{\alpha\gamma}^T \in O(d)$. Then $T_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^{-1} = T_{\alpha\gamma\beta}$ and

$$T_{\alpha\gamma\beta}\mathcal{U}_0T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}\mathcal{U}_0T_{\gamma\beta\alpha} = \mathcal{U}_0. \quad (4.5)$$

LEMMA 4.1. *If $r > 2$ then*

(a) $\mathcal{U}_0 \neq \mathcal{U}_*$

(b) *For all distinct index triples α, β, γ we have*

$$T_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \in G(\mathbb{K}) = \{T \in O(d) : T\mathbb{K}T^{-1} = \mathbb{K}\},$$

where $\mathbb{K}$ is either $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}}$ or $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}}$. The space $\mathbb{K}$ is a division algebra isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$, respectively.

Proof. For simplicity of notation let $T_1 = T_{\alpha\gamma\beta}$, $T_2 = T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}$ and $T_3 = T_{\gamma\beta\alpha}$. Choosing $\mathbf{I}_d \in \mathcal{U}_0$ we obtain that $T_1T_2 = u_0T_3^{-1}$ for some $u_0 \in \mathcal{U}_0 \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, $u_0T_3^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0T_3 = \mathcal{U}_0$, since $T_1T_2\mathcal{U}_0T_3 = \mathcal{U}_0$. Thus, $T_3^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0T_3 = u_0^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0$. Returning to (4.5) we obtain

$$\mathcal{U}_0 = T_1\mathcal{U}_0T_2T_3T_3^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0T_3 = T_1\mathcal{U}_0T_2T_3u_0^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0$$

It follows that for arbitrary $v \in \mathcal{U}_0$ and $w \in \mathcal{U}_0$

$$wv^{-1}u_0 \in T_1\mathcal{U}_0T_2T_3. \quad (4.6)$$

It is now easy to see that if $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_*$ then the set of elements $\{wv^{-1}u_0 : v, w \in \mathcal{U}_*\}$ span $\mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}}$ —a 4D vectors space, which cannot possibly be a subspace of the 3D space $T_1\mathcal{U}_0T_2T_3$. Part (a) is proved.

Now we may assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathbb{K}$ —a division algebra. In that case, (4.6) implies that $T_1\mathbb{K}T_1^{-1} = \mathbb{K}$, since $T_2T_3 = T_1^{-1}u_0$. So far we have proved that $\{T_1, T_3\} \subset G(\mathbb{K})$. But then $T_2 = T_1^{-1}u_0T_3^{-1} \in G(\mathbb{K})$, since $u_0 \in G(\mathbb{K})$ and $G(\mathbb{K})$ is a group. Part (b) is proved now. $\square$

We can now understand the relations between the space $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\beta}$. Lemma 4.1 excludes $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_*$, which leaves only the cases where $\mathcal{U}_0$ is a division algebra over $\mathbb{R}$. From (4.4) and Lemma 4.1 we have

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma} = R_{\alpha\beta}^T\mathcal{U}_0T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}\mathcal{U}_0R_{\gamma\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta}^T\mathcal{U}_0T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}\mathcal{U}_0T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}^{-1}T_{\beta\alpha\gamma}R_{\gamma\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta}^T\mathcal{U}_0R_{\beta\alpha}R_{\beta\gamma}^TR_{\gamma\beta}.$$

Let $F_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\beta}^TR_{\beta\alpha}$. We note that $F_{\alpha\beta} \in O(d)$ and $F_{\alpha\beta}^T = F_{\beta\alpha}$. Then $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma} = F_{\alpha\beta}R_{\beta\alpha}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{\beta\alpha}F_{\beta\gamma}$, where $\alpha \neq \beta \neq \gamma$. In particular, choosing $\beta = 1$, $\alpha > 1$, $\gamma > 1$ and $\alpha \neq \gamma$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma} = F_{\alpha 1}R_{1\alpha}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{1\alpha}F_{1\gamma}. \quad (4.7)$$

By Lemma 4.1 we have

$$R_{\alpha\beta}R_{\alpha\gamma}^T\mathcal{U}_0 = T_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_0T_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \mathcal{U}_0R_{\alpha\beta}R_{\alpha\gamma}^T.$$

Therefore, $R_{\alpha\gamma}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{\alpha\gamma} = R_{\alpha\beta}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{\alpha\beta}$, where $\alpha \neq \beta \neq \gamma$. In particular, choosing $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta > 1, \gamma > 1, \beta \neq \gamma$, we obtain

$$R_{1\gamma}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{1\gamma} = R_{1\beta}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{1\beta}. \quad (4.8)$$

Relation (4.8) says that the spaces $R_{1\beta}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{1\beta}$ do not depend on the choice of the index $\beta > 1$. Thus, regardless of the value of α in (4.7) we can write

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma} = F_{\alpha 1}R_{12}^{-1}\mathcal{U}_0R_{12}F_{1\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 1, \gamma > 1, \alpha \neq \gamma.$$

We can now change bases in the space W_α , $\alpha = 1, \dots, r$ according to the orthogonal change of basis matrices $Q_\alpha = F_{1\alpha}R_{12}$, $\alpha > 1$ and $Q_1 = \mathbf{I}_d$. We see that in the new bases the spaces $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma}$ will become $Q_\alpha\mathcal{U}_{\alpha\gamma}Q_\gamma^T = \mathcal{U}_0$. We obtain that $\Pi = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r) \otimes \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_d$, if $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{R}}$. In other words, elements of Π are $r \times r$ block matrices with the $\sigma\rho$ -th block of the form $a_{\sigma\rho}\mathbf{I}_d$, where $a_{\sigma\rho} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a_{\sigma\rho} = a_{\rho\sigma}$. The assumption that Π has no non-trivial invariant subspaces implies that we must have $d = 1$ and $\Pi = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$. If $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{C}}$, then $\Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r) \otimes \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_{d/2}$, where $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ denotes the real vector space of complex Hermitean $r \times r$ matrices. In other words elements of Π are $r \times r$ block matrices with the $\alpha\beta$ -th block of the form $\varphi(c_{\alpha\beta}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/2}$, where $c_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $c_{\alpha\beta} = \overline{c_{\beta\alpha}}$. The assumption that Π has no non-trivial invariant subspaces implies that we must have $d/2 = 1$ and $\Pi \cong \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ the space of $r \times r$ complex Hermitean matrices. If $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}^{\mathbb{H}}$, then $\Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r) \otimes \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_{d/4}$, in other words elements of Π are $r \times r$ block matrices with the $\alpha\beta$ -th block of the form $Q(q_{\alpha\beta}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{d/4}$, where $q_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{H}$ with $q_{\alpha\beta} = \overline{q_{\beta\alpha}}$. The assumption that Π has no non-trivial invariant subspaces implies that we must have $d/4 = 1$ and $\Pi \cong \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$ the space of $r \times r$ quaternionic Hermitean matrices. If $r = 2$ and $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_*$ then we can change basis in W_1 and W_2 so that $\mathcal{U}_* = \{Q(q) : q \in \mathbb{H}, \Re(q) = 0\}$. Thus, we have proved the following characterization of all irreducible Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let Π be an irreducible Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ then there exists an o.n.b. in which Π have one of the following forms*

- (a) *Real case:* $\Pi = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$
- (b) *Complex case:* $\Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^{n/2})$, i.e. n is even and all matrices $A \in \Pi$ have the block form with 2×2 blocks $\varphi(c_{\alpha\beta})$, where $c_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $c_{\beta\alpha} = \overline{c_{\alpha\beta}}$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, n/2$.
- (c) *Quaternionic case:* $\Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^{n/4})$, i.e. n is a multiple of 4 and all matrices $A \in \Pi$ have the block form with 4×4 blocks $Q(q_{\alpha\beta})$, where $q_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathbb{H}$, $q_{\beta\alpha} = \overline{q_{\alpha\beta}}$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, n/4$.
- (d) *Exceptional case:* $n = 8$ and

$$\Pi = \Pi_* = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q) \\ -Q(q) & \lambda_2 \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix} : \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \subset \mathbb{R}, q \in \mathbb{H}, \Re(q) = 0 \right\}. \quad (4.9)$$

It is interesting to compare the above characterization of irreducible Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ with the characterization of all simple, formally real Jordan algebras in [17]. We have shown that aside from the exceptional Albert algebra of 3×3 Hermitean octonionic matrices that cannot be embedded in any real matrix algebra [1], the only formally real Jordan algebras that cannot be embedded in $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are the algebras $\mathfrak{S}_N$, $N \geq 7$, where

$$\mathfrak{S}_N = \text{Span}\{1, s_1, \dots, s_{N-1}, s_\alpha * s_\beta = \delta_{\alpha\beta} 1, \alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, N-1\}.$$

We note that

$$\mathfrak{S}_1 = \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathfrak{S}_3 \cong \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^2), \quad \mathfrak{S}_4 \cong \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^2), \quad \mathfrak{S}_5 \cong \Pi_*, \quad \mathfrak{S}_6 \cong \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2),$$

while $\mathfrak{S}_2$ is not simple.

5 Jordan automorphisms

Observe that all of the orthogonally distinct irreducible subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ are non-isomorphic. Therefore, the isomorphisms T_α in the structure theorem 3.10 can be made to be automorphisms of an irreducible algebra by an appropriate change of the o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

5.1 Automorphism of Π_*

The automorphisms T_* of Π_* are the easiest. We first observe that T_* must map $\mathbf{I}_8$ into $\mathbf{I}_8$, since $\mathbf{I}_8$ is defined by the property $\mathbf{I}_8 * K = K$ for all $K \in \Pi_*$. Next we observe that if

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q) \\ -Q(q) & -\lambda \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix} \in \Pi_*,$$

then $K^2 = (\lambda^2 + |q|^2) \mathbf{I}_8$. Thus,

$$T_* K = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda' \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q') \\ -Q(q') & -\lambda' \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

where λ' and q' depend linearly on λ and q , while in addition we have $(\lambda')^2 + |q'|^2 = \lambda^2 + |q|^2$. Thus, there is $R \in O(4)$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} q' \\ \lambda' \end{bmatrix} = R \begin{bmatrix} q \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here we make no distinction between the quaternion $q = q_1 i + q_2 j + q_3 k$ and the vector $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Conversely, if $R \in O(4)$ effects the transformation $[\lambda, q] \rightarrow [\lambda', q']$ then $(T_* K)^2 = T_*(K^2)$.

If we write $R \in O(4)$ in the block form

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} R_0 & r \\ r' & \rho \end{bmatrix}, \quad R_0 \in \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^3), \quad \{r, r'\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \rho \in \mathbb{R},$$

then we can write the formula for T_* explicitly:

$$T_* \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q) \\ -Q(q) & \lambda_2 \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda'_1 \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q') \\ -Q(q') & \lambda'_2 \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda'_1 &= \frac{1+\rho}{2} \lambda_1 + \frac{1-\rho}{2} \lambda_2 + (r', q) \\ \lambda'_2 &= \frac{1-\rho}{2} \lambda_1 + \frac{1+\rho}{2} \lambda_2 - (r', q) \\ q' &= R_0 q + \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{2} r. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the Jordan algebra automorphism T_* extends to the Jordan algebra automorphism T of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ by defining

$$T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I}_4 \\ \mathbf{I}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \pm \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I}_4 \\ \mathbf{I}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

These are the only possibilities, since

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I}_4 \\ \mathbf{I}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^2 = \mathbf{I}_8, \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{I}_4 \\ \mathbf{I}_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix} * \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \mathbf{I}_4 & Q(q) \\ -Q(q) & -\lambda \mathbf{I}_4 \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

We conclude, that the Jordan algebra automorphisms of Π_* are simply restrictions of those Jordan algebra automorphisms of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ that map Π_* into itself.

5.2 Automorphisms of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$, $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ and $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$

Let us now compute the automorphism group for $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$. As a consequence of the analysis we will also obtain the automorphisms for $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$ and $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$. Let $e_1, \dots, e_r$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{H}^r$ viewed as the right $\mathbb{H}$ -module (see [20, p. 642]). We observe that T maps an orthogonal projection into an orthogonal projection, since $T(A^2) = (TA)^2$. Also, If the two projections are mutually orthogonal then their T -images must also be mutually orthogonal. Hence the matrices $e_1 \otimes e_1, \dots, e_r \otimes e_r$ get mapped into the matrices $u_1 \otimes \overline{u_1}, \dots, u_r \otimes \overline{u_r}$, where the vectors $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\} \subset \mathbb{H}^r$, are mutually orthogonal⁴. Let us fix $\alpha \neq \beta$ and let $M = T(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha)$. Then we have

$$(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (e_\alpha \otimes e_\alpha) = e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha \quad \Rightarrow \quad M * (u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}) = M.$$

⁴The two vectors a and b are orthogonal in $\mathbb{H}^r$ if $(a, b) = \overline{a_1}b_1 + \dots + \overline{a_r}b_r = 0$.

Thus, there is a vector $m \in \mathbb{H}^r$ such that $M = m \otimes \overline{u_\alpha} + u_\alpha \otimes \overline{m}$. Changing index α to β we also get $M = p \otimes \overline{u_\beta} + u_\beta \otimes \overline{p}$ for some $p \in \mathbb{H}^r$. Equating the two forms of M we obtain

$$m = u_\alpha a_1 + u_\beta a_2, \quad p = u_\alpha b_1 + u_\beta b_2,$$

Substituting this back into the formula for M we obtain

$$\overline{a_1} = -a_1, \quad \overline{b_2} = -b_2, \quad a_2 = \overline{b_1}.$$

In particular M must have the form

$$M = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\beta a_2} + u_\beta a_2 \otimes \overline{u_\alpha},$$

Applying T to the relation

$$(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha)^2 = e_\alpha \otimes e_\alpha + e_\beta \otimes e_\beta$$

we obtain $M^2 = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\alpha} + u_\beta \otimes \overline{u_\beta}$. This is satisfied if and only if $|a_2| = 1$. Hence, for any $\alpha \neq \beta$ there are unit quaternions $a^{(\alpha\beta)} = \overline{a^{(\beta\alpha)}}$ such that

$$M = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\beta a^{(\alpha\beta)}} + u_\beta a^{(\alpha\beta)} \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}.$$

If $r > 2$ we applying T to the identity

$$(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (e_\beta \otimes e_\gamma + e_\gamma \otimes e_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(e_\alpha \otimes e_\gamma + e_\gamma \otimes e_\alpha)$$

we conclude that the complex number $a^{(\alpha\beta)}$ satisfy the relations $a^{(\beta\gamma)} a^{(\alpha\beta)} = a^{(\alpha\gamma)}$. Thus for any $\alpha \neq \beta \neq 1$ we have $a^{(\alpha\beta)} = a^{(1\beta)} a^{(\alpha 1)}$. It follows that

$$M = u_\alpha a^{(1\alpha)} \otimes \overline{u_\beta a^{(1\beta)}} + u_\beta a^{(1\beta)} \otimes \overline{u_\alpha a^{(1\alpha)}}.$$

Now, replacing vectors u_α with $a^{(1\alpha)} u_\alpha$, for all $\alpha = 2, \dots, r$ we obtain

$$T(e_\alpha \otimes e_\alpha) = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}, \quad T(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\beta} + u_\beta \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}$$

for an o.n.b. $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\} \subset \mathbb{H}^r$.

Now, let $P = T(i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha)$. Observe that P has exactly the same set of properties as the one used to derive the formula for M :

$$(i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (e_\alpha \otimes e_\alpha) = i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha \Rightarrow P * (u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}) = P,$$

$$(i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (e_\beta \otimes e_\beta) = i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha \Rightarrow P * (u_\beta \otimes \overline{u_\beta}) = P,$$

$$(i e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - i e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha)^2 = e_\alpha \otimes e_\alpha + e_\beta \otimes e_\beta \Rightarrow P^2 = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\alpha} + u_\beta \otimes \overline{u_\beta}.$$

We conclude that there are unit quaternions $t^{(\alpha\beta)} = -\overline{t^{(\beta\alpha)}}$ such that

$$P = u_\alpha \otimes \overline{u_\beta t^{(\alpha\beta)}} + u_\beta t^{(\alpha\beta)} \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}.$$

Next, we observe that

$$(e_\alpha \otimes e_\beta + e_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = 0.$$

Therefore, $\overline{t^{(\alpha\beta)}} = -t^{(\alpha\beta)}$, i.e. $t^{(\alpha\beta)}$ are purely imaginary unit quaternions. When $r > 2$, the relation

$$(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (e_\beta \otimes e_\gamma + e_\gamma \otimes e_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\gamma - ie_\gamma \otimes e_\alpha)$$

implies that $t^{(\alpha\beta)} = t^{(\alpha\gamma)}$. Hence, all numbers $t^{(\alpha\beta)}$, $\alpha \neq \beta$ must be the same: $t^{(\alpha\beta)} = -\tau_i$. We conclude that

$$T(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = u_\alpha \tau_i \otimes \overline{u_\beta} - u_\beta \tau_i \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}.$$

Similarly,

$$T(je_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - je_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = u_\alpha \tau_j \otimes \overline{u_\beta} - u_\beta \tau_j \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}.$$

$$T(ke_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ke_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = u_\alpha \tau_k \otimes \overline{u_\beta} - u_\beta \tau_k \otimes \overline{u_\alpha}.$$

Applying T to the relations

$$(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (je_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - je_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = 0,$$

$$(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (ke_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ke_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = 0,$$

$$(ke_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ke_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (je_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - je_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) = 0$$

we obtain

$$\tau_i \tau_j = -\tau_j \tau_i, \quad \tau_i \tau_k = -\tau_k \tau_i, \quad \tau_k \tau_j = -\tau_j \tau_k.$$

We conclude that the vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$ representing the purely imaginary unit quaternions τ_i, τ_j, τ_k form an o.n.b. of $\mathbb{R}^3$. If $r = 2$ there are no other restrictions on τ_i, τ_j, τ_k . Hence, there are two possibilities

$$\tau_i \tau_j = \tau_k, \quad \tau_j \tau_k = \tau_i, \quad \tau_k \tau_i = \tau_j \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\tau_i \tau_j = -\tau_k, \quad \tau_j \tau_k = -\tau_i, \quad \tau_k \tau_i = -\tau_j. \tag{5.2}$$

If $r > 2$ then we have additional relations

$$(ie_\alpha \otimes e_\beta - ie_\beta \otimes e_\alpha) * (je_\beta \otimes e_\gamma - je_\gamma \otimes e_\beta) = \frac{1}{2}(ke_\alpha \otimes e_\gamma - ke_\gamma \otimes e_\alpha)$$

plus the two other relations obtained by the cyclic permutations of i, j and k . It follows that (5.1) must hold and (5.2) is ruled out. We conclude that any Jordan algebra automorphism T of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$, when $r > 2$, has the form

$$TA = U(h \cdot A)U^*, \quad (h \cdot A)_{\alpha\beta} = h \cdot A_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{5.3}$$

where $U \in U(r, \mathbb{H})$ (i.e. $U \in \text{End}(\mathbb{H})$ and $U^*U = \mathbf{I}_r$) and $h : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is an $\mathbb{R}$ -linear division algebra automorphism acting on all elements of A . The group of such automorphisms is

isomorphic to $SO(3)$. The group acts on the 3D space of imaginary parts of quaternions by rotations. When $r = 2$ the automorphisms T have the same form (5.3), except the map h can be represented by elements of the orthogonal group $O(3)$, instead of $SO(3)$. For the algebra $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ the imaginary unit τ_i can only be i or $-i$. Therefore, in this case the Jordan algebra automorphisms of $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ must have the form $TA = UAU^*$ or $TA = U\bar{A}U^*$, where $U \in U(r)$. This is the same form as (5.3), where we take into account the fact that the group of $\mathbb{R}$ -linear automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2$ consisting of the trivial map and complex conjugation. Our proof also shows that all Jordan algebra automorphism T of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$ have the form $TA = RAR^T$, $R \in O(r)$. Once again (5.3) describes the automorphism group, if we take into account that there is no non-trivial $\mathbb{R}$ -linear automorphisms of $\mathbb{R}$.

Recall that our goal is to classify all Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ up to the orthogonal isomorphism, corresponding to the choice of an o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular we can change a basis and modify the automorphisms $T_1, \dots, T_{k-1}$ in the representation (3.8) by conjugation with the orthogonal transformations. Therefore, we can simplify the automorphism maps T in (3.8). In fact our explicit characterization immediately shows that up to the orthogonal transformations the automorphism $T : \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r) \rightarrow \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r)$ is the identity map, the map $T : \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r) \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$ is either an identity map or complex conjugation $A \mapsto \bar{A}$, while the map $T : \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r) \rightarrow \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$ reduces to the $\mathbb{R}$ -linear division algebra automorphism $A \mapsto h \cdot A$ and conjugation map $A \mapsto \bar{A}$, if $r = 2$.

LEMMA 5.1.

- (a) *There is $R \in O(2r)$ such that $RAR^T = \bar{A}$ for any $A \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$.*
- (b) *For any $\mathbb{R}$ -linear division algebra automorphism h there exists $R_h \in O(4r)$ such that $R_h AR_h^T = h \cdot A$ for any $A \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$.*
- (c) *If $r = 2$ the quaternionic conjugation map cannot be represented as a conjugation by orthogonal maps*

Proof. To prove part (a) we observe that $\psi(i) \in O(2)$, $\psi(i)^T = \psi(i)$ and $\psi(i)\varphi(c)\psi(i) = \varphi(\bar{C})$. Therefore, $R = \psi(i) \otimes \mathbf{I}_r \in O(2r)$, $R^T = R$ and $RAR = \bar{A}$ for any $A \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r)$. To prove part (b) we recall the Skolem-Noether theorem that for any $\mathbb{R}$ -linear division algebra automorphism h there exists a unit quaternion u_h such that $h \cdot q = u_h q u_h^{-1}$ for any $q \in \mathbb{H}$, since $\mathbb{H}$ is a central simple algebra over $\mathbb{R}$. We note that $R_h = Q(u_h) \otimes \mathbf{I}_r \in O(4r)$ and $R_h AR_h^T = h \cdot A$ for any $A \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r)$. To prove part (c) we verify, using a symbolic algebra package, that the conjugation map $J : A \mapsto \bar{A}$ on $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ fails to satisfy the 4-chain relation (3.9). $\square$

6 Conclusions

In this section we summarize and discuss the obtained results.

6.1 Structure theorem

THEOREM 6.1 (Jordan algebra structure theorem).

1. Let Π be a Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then

$$\Pi = \Pi_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \Pi_m,$$

as a direct sum of algebras. More precisely there exists an o.n.b. of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in which

$$\Pi = \{\text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m, 0) : A_1 \in \Pi_1, \dots, A_m \in \Pi_m\},$$

where each Π_α is a simple non-singular Jordan subalgebra of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^{d_\alpha})$, for some $d_\alpha \geq 1$ for which $d_1 + \dots + d_m \leq n$.

2. There exists an o.n.b. in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that a simple non-singular Jordan subalgebra Π of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ has one of the following forms

$$(a) \ \Pi = \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/r}, \ r \geq 1$$

$$(b) \ \Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/2r}, \ r \geq 2$$

$$(c) \ \Pi = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/4r}, \ r \geq 2$$

$$(d) \ \Pi = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A \otimes \mathbf{I}_{s_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{A} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{s_2} \end{bmatrix} : A \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2) \right\}, \quad s_1 + s_2 = n/8, \quad s_1 s_2 \neq 0$$

$$(e) \ \Pi = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} A \otimes \mathbf{I}_{s_1} & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{A} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{s_2} \end{bmatrix} : A \in \Pi_* \right\}, \quad s_1 + s_2 = n/8, \quad s_1 \neq 0$$

6.2 Completeness

The explicit characterization of all Jordan subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ in Theorem 6.1 allows us to answer a question about completeness of a subalgebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

THEOREM 6.2 (Completeness theorem).

- (a) A subalgebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is complete if and only if all simple non-singular algebras $\Pi_\alpha \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^{d_\alpha})$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$ in part 1 of Theorem 6.1 are complete.
- (b) A simple non-singular algebra $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is complete if and only if it is orthogonally equivalent to one of the algebras in cases (a), (b) or (c) in part 2 of Theorem 6.1.

Proof. Part (a) is obvious. To prove part (b) we observe that $\mathfrak{A}(\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/r}) = \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/r}$, $\mathfrak{A}(\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/2r}) = \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/2r}$, and $\mathfrak{A}(\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/4r}) = \text{End}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathbb{H}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/4r}$. We also have $\mathfrak{A}(\Pi_*) = \text{End}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathbb{H}^2)$, while $(\text{End}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathbb{H}^2))_{\text{sym}} = \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2) \neq \Pi_*$. A computer algebra system can verify that

$$\overline{A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 + A_4 A_3 A_2 A_1} \neq \bar{A}_1 \bar{A}_2 \bar{A}_3 \bar{A}_4 + \bar{A}_4 \bar{A}_3 \bar{A}_2 \bar{A}_1$$

at least for some $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\} \subset \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$. □

Remark 6.3. We observe that part (c) with $r = 2$ and part (d) represent two different embeddings of the same algebra $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ in $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. One embedding is complete, while the other is not.

6.3 Symmetric subalgebras of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

The corollary of our analysis is an explicit characterization of all subalgebras $\mathcal{B}$ of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ closed under transposition: $\mathcal{B}^T = \mathcal{B}$. We will call such algebras symmetric subalgebras of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

THEOREM 6.4. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a symmetric subalgebra of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then*

•

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{B}_m.$$

More precisely there exists an o.n.b. of $\mathbb{R}^n$ in which

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m, 0) : A_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, \dots, A_m \in \mathcal{B}_m\},$$

where each $\mathcal{B}_j$ is a simple non-singular symmetric subalgebra of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, for some $d_j \geq 1$ for which $d_1 + \dots + d_m \leq n$.

- *A simple symmetric non-singular subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is orthogonally equivalent to one of the three possible forms*

$$(a) \ \mathcal{B} = \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/r}, \ r \geq 1$$

$$(b) \ \mathcal{B} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/2r}, \ r \geq 1$$

$$(c) \ \mathcal{B} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{H}}(\mathbb{H}^r) \otimes \mathbf{I}_{n/4r}, \ r \geq 1$$

Theorem 6.4 should be compared with the well-known fact that there is no effective characterization of all subalgebras of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Our characterization also provides two examples of the symmetric associative algebras $\mathcal{B}$ such that $\mathfrak{A}(\mathcal{B}_{\text{sym}}) \subsetneq \mathcal{B}$. They are cases (b) and (c) in part 2 of Theorem 6.4 corresponding to $r = 1$. Indeed, for $\mathcal{B} = \{\varphi(c) : c \in \mathbb{C}\}$ we have $\mathcal{B}_{\text{sym}} = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_2$, while, for $\mathcal{B} = \{Q(q) : q \in \mathbb{H}\}$ we have $\mathcal{B}_{\text{sym}} = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{I}_4$.

6.4 Completeness of multialgebras

Suppose now that we are looking for all subalgebras of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ that are closed not only with respect to the product (2.5) but also with respect to the products (2.2), where the subspace $\mathcal{A}$ of multiplications is spanned by finitely many matrices $A_1 = \mathbf{I}_n, A_2, \dots, A_s$. Let Π be a non-singular $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra. Then $A_\alpha = \mathbf{I}_n A_\alpha \mathbf{I}_n \in \Pi$, $\alpha = 2, \dots, s$. We first choose a basis in which Π has the form described in the Structure Theorem 6.1. In that basis the submatrices of $A_2, \dots, A_s$ corresponding to $\mathcal{N}(\Pi)^\perp$ must be block-diagonal, with each block being a member of a simple component Π_α of Π . If Π_α satisfies the 4-chain condition with

respect to the single multiplication (2.5) then it will also satisfy the p -chain condition for any $p \geq 5$. It follows that 3 and 4-chain conditions will hold for the α -th block of Π for all multiplications in (2.2), since the α -th blocks of matrices $A_2, \dots, A_s$ will be in Π_α . We have identified two possibilities for Π_α to fail completeness. One is that Π_α be isomorphic to Π_* and the other is that Π_α be isomorphic to $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ and has the block-diagonal structure as in part 2(d) of Theorem 6.1. Therefore, whether or not all $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras Π are complete will depend on whether it is possible to find an o.n.b. in which all matrices $A_2, \dots, A_s$ have the upper left 8×8 submatrix in Π_* , or 16×16 submatrix M_{16} of the form

$$M_{16} = \begin{bmatrix} H & 0 \\ 0 & \overline{H} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H \in \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{H}^2). \quad (6.1)$$

Even though these possibilities cannot be ruled out in general, we may try to understand when such algebras can arise generically. The subspace of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of all matrices whose upper left 8×8 submatrix is in Π_* has co-dimension 31, while the set of all matrices whose upper left 16×16 submatrix has the form (6.1) has co-dimension 124. Therefore, the space $\mathcal{V}_0$ of s -tuples of symmetric matrices (one of which is $\mathbf{I}_n$), all of whose 8×8 submatrices is in Π_* has co-dimension $31(s-1)$. The dimension of the $O(n)$ orbit of a generic s -tuple of matrices is $n(n-1)/2$. The subspace $\mathcal{V}_0$ will intersect this $O(n)$ orbit generically only if $n(n-1) \geq 62(s-1)$. For example, for a generic 5-dimensional space $\mathcal{A}$ (containing $\mathbf{I}_n$), all Jordan multialgebras will be complete, if $n < 17$. These dimensional considerations explain the reason for completeness in all of the examples in [11, 9, 10, 13]. Conjecture 2.3 suggests that another way to eliminate failure of completeness may be to restrict the Jordan multialgebras to $SO(2)$ or $SO(3)$ -invariant ones. Appendix B gives an example, where $\mathcal{A}$ is 5-dimensional, but all $SO(3)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras are complete *for any value of n* . The analogous example in the $SO(2)$ context in Appendix C produces examples of incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multi-algebras.

7 Acknowledgement

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1008092.

A Theory of exact relations for effective tensors of composite materials

Let $G = SO(d)$, $d = 2$ or 3 , and let $\mathcal{T}$ be a finite dimensional representation space of G . The space $\mathcal{T}$ is also equipped with the G -invariant inner product. The elements of $\mathcal{T}$ represent values of physical fields in a material. For example, the electric and the current fields take values in $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}^3$ with the standard action of $G = SO(3)$, i.e. $\mathcal{T} = W_1$. In a fiber-reinforced composite the group G is $SO(2)$, in that case the space of field values $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{R}^3 = W_1 \oplus W_0$. The

material properties are elements of $\text{Sym}^+(\mathcal{T})$ —symmetric positive definite operators on $\mathcal{T}$. Taking two materials $\{L_1, L_2\} \subset \text{Sym}^+(\mathcal{T})$ we may form a laminate—a composite consisting of layers of material L_1 alternating with layers of material L_2 . Such a laminate is described by the direction of the lamination $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ (when $G = SO(d)$) and the volume fractions of L_1 and L_2 are θ_1 and $\theta_2 = 1 - \theta_1$ respectively. At the length scale at which the single layer width is infinitesimal, the laminate will be indistinguishable from a homogeneous material. The homogenization theory [2, 16] supports this assertion mathematically for arbitrary composites whose microstructure length scale is infinitesimal. In the case of a laminate there exists a beautiful explicit formula for the effective tensor [25, 27]

$$W_{\mathbf{n}}(L^*; L_0) = \theta_1 W_{\mathbf{n}}(L_1; L_0) + \theta_2 W_{\mathbf{n}}(L_2; L_0),$$

where L_0 is an arbitrary “reference material” and the map $W_{\mathbf{n}}(L, L_0)$ has the form

$$W_{\mathbf{n}}(L; L_0) = [(L_0 - L)^{-1} - \Gamma_{L_0}(\mathbf{n})]^{-1} = [\mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{T}} - (L_0 - L)\Gamma_{L_0}(\mathbf{n})]^{-1}(L_0 - L).$$

Here $\Gamma_{L_0}(\mathbf{n}) \in \text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ is an explicitly known function of $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ satisfying $R \cdot \Gamma_{L_0}(\mathbf{n}) = \Gamma_{L_0}(R\mathbf{n})$ for all $R \in G$, provided $L_0 \in \text{Sym}^+(\mathcal{T})$ is a fixed point of G -action. For example, in the case of conductivity

$$\Gamma_{L_0}(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{\mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}}{(L_0 \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{n})}.$$

Definition A.1. A *lamination exact relation* is a submanifold $\mathbb{M}$ in $\text{Sym}^+(\mathcal{T})$ such that $L^* \in \mathbb{M}$ whenever $\{L_1, L_2\} \subset \mathbb{M}$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ and $\theta_1 \in [0, 1]$.

It is clear from the definition that the $W_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}; L_0)$ is a convex subset of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ and at the same time the surface of the same co-dimension as $\mathbb{M}$. Therefore, $W_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}; L_0)$ is an affine subspace of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$. However, choosing $L_0 \in \mathbb{M}$ and observing that $W(L_0; L_0) = 0$ implies that the affine subspaces $\Pi_{\mathbf{n}} = W_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}; L_0)$ are linear subspaces of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$. The function $\Lambda_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}} = W_{\mathbf{m}} \circ W_{\mathbf{n}}^{-1}$ maps $\Pi_{\mathbf{n}}$ into $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}}$ diffeomorphically (at least in the neighborhood of 0). We easily compute

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}(K) = [K^{-1} + \Gamma(\mathbf{n}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{m})]^{-1} = [\mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{T}} - (\Gamma(\mathbf{m}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{n}))K]^{-1}K.$$

We see that the differential of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}$ is the identity map: $d\Lambda_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}(0)\xi = \xi$ for any $\xi \in T_0\Pi_{\mathbf{n}}$. That means that the tangent spaces of $\Pi_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}}$ are the same. It follows that $\Pi_{\mathbf{n}} = \Pi_{\mathbf{m}}$, since the spaces $\Pi_{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathbf{m}}$ coincide with their tangent spaces. Thus, the $\Pi = W_{\mathbf{n}}(\mathbb{M}; L_0)$ is a well-defined subspace of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$. Expanding the map $\Lambda_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{m}} : \Pi \rightarrow \Pi$ in powers of K we obtain

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}(K) = KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}K + KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}K + KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}KA_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}}K + \dots,$$

where $A_{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}} = \Gamma(\mathbf{m}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{n})$. We conclude that for $\mathbb{M}$ to be a lamination exact relation it is necessary and sufficient that

$$KAK \in \Pi, \quad K \in \Pi, \quad A \in \mathcal{A} = \text{Span}\{\Gamma(\mathbf{m}) - \Gamma(\mathbf{n}) : |\mathbf{n}| = 1\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The subspaces Π satisfying (A.1) are also closed with respect to several Jordan algebra products

$$K_1 *_A K_2 = \frac{1}{2}(K_1 A K_2 + K_2 A K_1), \quad A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Definition A.2. *The submanifold $\mathbb{M}$ of $\text{Sym}^+(\mathcal{T})$ is called **an exact relation** if the effective tensor L^* of a composite will lie in $\mathbb{M}$, whenever constituent materials lie in $\mathbb{M}$, regardless of the microstructure.*

We have shown in [11] and [9] that if the Jordan multialgebra Π is complete in the sense of Definition 2.2 then it corresponds to an exact relation $\mathbb{M} = W_n^{-1}(\Pi; L_0)$. It is a modification of the proof of Cohn's theorem (see [15, p. 8]) to show that Π is complete if and only if (2.4) holds.

B $SO(3)$ invariant Jordan multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$

Let $\mathcal{T} = W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$. From the representation theory of $SO(3)$ we have $\text{Sym}(W_1) \cong W_0 \oplus W_2$. Let $\mathcal{A} = W_2 \otimes \mathbf{I}_n \subset \text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$. Thermoelectric properties of composites would fit in this context with $n = 2$. In this section we recall, for the sake of completeness, the explicit characterization, achieved in [11], of all $SO(3)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$.

THEOREM B.1. *Let Π be an $SO(3)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$, where $\mathcal{A} = W_2 \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$. Then there exists an associative subalgebra $\mathcal{B}$ of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, such that $\mathcal{B}^T = \mathcal{B}$ and $\Pi = (\text{End}(W_1) \otimes \mathcal{B})_{\text{sym}}$.*

Proof. Recall that all the irreps of $SO(3)$ are of real type. In other words $\text{End}_{SO(3)}(W_m)$ consists of real multiples of the identity for all $m \geq 0$. Therefore, an arbitrary $SO(3)$ -submodule of $\text{Sym}(\mathcal{T})$ will have the form

$$\Pi = W_0 \otimes \mathcal{L}_0 \oplus W_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus W_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}_2,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_0$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are subspaces of $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, while $\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \text{Skew}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. For any two subspaces V_1 and V_2 of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ we define

$$V_1 V_2 = \text{Span}\{X_1 X_2 : X_1 \in V_1, X_2 \in V_2\}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

It is easy to check that with subspace multiplication defined by (B.1) $SO(3)$ submodules of $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$ form a semiring. In order to understand the semiring structure we need to understand the multiplication of irreps in $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$. This was done in [11] for $SO(3)$ and generalized to some other groups with similar properties in [31, 30, 19]. According to the Clebsch-Gordon formula

$$W_i \otimes W_j = \bigoplus_{k \in I(i,j)} W_k, \quad I(i,j) = \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : |i-j| \leq k \leq i+j\}, \quad i \geq 0, j \geq 0.$$

Observe that the map

$$\Phi : \text{End}(W_1) \otimes \text{End}(W_1) \rightarrow \text{End}(W_1), \quad \Phi(X \otimes Y) = XY.$$

is surjective and commutes with rotations. Therefore,

$$W_i W_j = \bigoplus_{k \in J(i,j)} W_k, \quad J(i,j) \subset I'(i,j) = I(i,j) \cap \{0, 1, 2\}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

It is not hard to check by hand that in fact $J = I'(i,j)$. We remark that there are values $m > 1$ and pairs (i,j) for which $J(i,j) \neq I(i,j) \cap \{0, 1, \dots, 2m\}$ in $\text{End}(W_m)$. The multiplication rule (B.2) permits us to describe the products of two arbitrary $SO(3)$ submodules of $\text{End}(\mathcal{T})$:

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^2 W_i \otimes \mathcal{L}_i \right) \left(\sum_{j=0}^2 W_i \otimes \mathcal{M}_j \right) = \sum_{i,j=0}^2 W_i W_j \otimes \mathcal{L}_i \mathcal{M}_j. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Using (B.3) we can write the condition (A.1) in terms of the subspaces $\mathcal{L}_i$

$$\begin{aligned} [(\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)^2]_{\text{sym}} &\subset \mathcal{L}_2, \\ [(\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2) * (\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)]_{\text{skew}} &\subset \mathcal{L}_1, \\ [(\mathcal{L}_0 * \mathcal{L}_2) + (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)^2]_{\text{sym}} &\subset \mathcal{L}_0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $\mathcal{L}_i * \mathcal{L}_j = \mathcal{L}_i \mathcal{L}_j + \mathcal{L}_j \mathcal{L}_i$.

LEMMA B.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}_0$, $\mathcal{L}_1$ and $\mathcal{L}_2$ solve (B.4). Then $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_2$ and there is an associative symmetric subalgebra $\mathcal{B} \subset \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{B}_{\text{skew}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{B}_{\text{sym}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2$. Then the subspaces $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}^2$ are closed under transposition. The first equation (B.4) says that $(\mathcal{B}^2)_{\text{sym}} \subset \mathcal{L}_2 \subset \mathcal{B}$, while the second equation (B.4) says $(\mathcal{B}^2)_{\text{skew}} \subset \mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{B}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{B}^2 = (\mathcal{B}^2)_{\text{sym}} \oplus (\mathcal{B}^2)_{\text{skew}} \subset \mathcal{B}$. Thus $\mathcal{B}$ is an associative subalgebra of $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Since $\mathcal{B}^T = \mathcal{B}$, the algebra $\mathcal{B}$ is semisimple, and therefore, $\mathcal{B}^2 = \mathcal{B}$ (see e.g. [20]). The third equation (B.4) says that $(\mathcal{B}^2)_{\text{sym}} \subset \mathcal{L}_0$. Thus, $\mathcal{L}_2 \subset \mathcal{L}_0$. It remains to establish the reverse inclusion. From the first and second equations (B.4) we obtain respectively that $(\mathcal{L}_0 * \mathcal{B})_{\text{sym}} \subset \mathcal{L}_2$ and $(\mathcal{L}_0 * \mathcal{B})_{\text{skew}} \subset \mathcal{L}_1$. The two inclusions combine to

$$\mathcal{L}_0 * \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{B}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

This suggests our next step. Let

$$\mathcal{B}' = \{b \in \text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n) : b\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{B} \text{ and } \mathcal{B}b \subset \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{B}'$ is the largest associative subalgebra in $\text{End}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ containing $\mathcal{B}$ as a two-sided ideal. The relation (B.5) can then be reformulated as $\mathcal{L}_0 \subset \mathcal{B}'$. It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{B}'$ is closed under transposition and, therefore, semisimple. Thus $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \oplus \mathcal{C}$ as a direct sum of algebras, where

$$\mathcal{C} = \{c \in \mathcal{B}' : cb = bc = 0 \text{ for all } b \in \mathcal{B}\}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We see that the complementary ideal $\mathcal{C}$ is also closed under transposition. Therefore, if $a \in \mathcal{L}_0 \subset \mathcal{B}'$ and $a = b + c$ with $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$, it follows that both b and c are symmetric matrices. From the first equation (B.4) we have $(\mathcal{L}_0^2)_{\text{sym}} \subset \mathcal{L}_2$. Therefore, $a^2 = b^2 + c^2 \in \mathcal{B}$. Thus, $c^2 = 0$, implying $c = 0$ for a symmetric matrix c . So, we have proved that $\mathcal{L}_0 \subset \mathcal{L}_2$, which yields, together with the reverse inclusion, that $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_2$. Now it is easy to verify that all equations (B.4) are satisfied. $\square$

$\square$

C Incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$

We remark that Theorem B.1 together with Theorem 6.4 completely characterizes all $SO(3)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras in $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$ and shows that all the $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebras are complete. An arbitrary $SO(2)$ -submodule Π of $\text{Sym}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$ is characterized by a pair of vector spaces $\mathcal{L}$ —a real vector space in $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $\mathcal{M}$ —a complex vector space in $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. Specifically,

$$\Pi = \{\varphi(1) \otimes X_1 + \varphi(i) \otimes X_2 + \psi(1) \otimes Y_1 + \psi(i) \otimes Y_2 : X_1 + iX_2 \in \mathcal{L}, Y_1 + iY_2 \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = W_2 \otimes \mathbf{I}_n = \{\psi(a) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n : a \in \mathbb{C}\}$. The subspace Π is an $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra if and only if

$$Y^2 + XX^T \in \mathcal{M}, \quad YX + XY^* \in \mathcal{L} \text{ for all } X \in \mathcal{L}, Y \in \mathcal{M}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

An arbitrary $SO(2)$ -submodule Π' of $\text{End}(W_1 \otimes \mathbb{R}^n)$ is characterized by a pair of vector spaces $\mathcal{L}'$ —a real vector space in $\text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ —a complex vector space in $\text{End}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. The subspace Π' is an $SO(2)$ -invariant associative $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra if and only if

$$Y_1 Y_2 + X_1 \overline{X_2} \in \mathcal{M}', \quad Y_1 X_2 + X_1 \overline{Y_2} \in \mathcal{L}' \text{ for all } \{X_1, X_2\} \subset \mathcal{L}', \{Y_1, Y_2\} \subset \mathcal{M}'. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We also have $(X, Y)_{\text{sym}} = ((X + X^*)/2, (Y + Y^T)/2)$. We may represent elements of Π and Π' formally as quaternionic matrices

$$\Pi = Y + Xj, \quad \Pi' = Y' + X'j, \quad X \in \mathcal{L}, Y \in \mathcal{M}, X' \in \mathcal{L}', Y' \in \mathcal{M}'.$$

Taking into account that the multiplication of a complex matrix $Z = Z_1 + iZ_2$ by j has the property $jZ = \overline{Z}j$ we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}(K_1 K_2 + K_2 K_1) \in \Pi, \quad K'_1 K'_2 \in \Pi' \text{ for all } \{K_1, K_2\} \subset \Pi, \{K'_1, K'_2\} \subset \Pi'.$$

We also have $(Y + Xj)^T = Y^T + jX^T = Y^T + X^*j$.

Let us exhibit several families of solutions of (C.1). Let $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be a Jordan subalgebra, as in the main part of this paper. Let

$$\mathcal{L} = \{0\}, \quad \mathcal{M} = \Pi \otimes \mathbb{C} \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{C}^n). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

It is now clear that (C.1) is satisfied. Let us show that

$$\mathcal{L}' = \{0\}, \quad \mathcal{M}' = \mathfrak{A}(\Pi) \otimes \mathbb{C}$$

Describes the smallest associative $SO(2)$ -invariant multialgebra containing $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$. It is clear, that the pair $(\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{M}')$ satisfies (C.2). Let $(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}, \widehat{\mathcal{M}})$ denotes the pair of subspaces describing smallest associative $SO(2)$ -invariant multialgebra containing $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$. We see that all the products $A_1 \dots A_m \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ for any $\{A_1, \dots, A_m\} \subset \Pi$. Thus, $\mathfrak{A}(\Pi) \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}$. It follows that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} = \{0\}$, while $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}' = \mathfrak{A}(\Pi) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. This result shows that if $\Pi \subset \text{Sym}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is incomplete then so is the $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebra described by (C.3). In particular, we get an example of incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebra corresponding to $\Pi = \Pi_*$, when $n = 8$.

There is another family of solutions of (C.1)

$$\mathcal{M} = \{a\mathbf{I}_n : a \in \mathbb{C}\}, \quad XX^T = \lambda\mathbf{I}_n, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \text{for all } X \in \mathcal{L} \subset \mathfrak{H}(\mathbb{C}^n).$$

If $n = 4$ it provides another example of the incomplete $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan $\mathcal{A}$ -multialgebra, when

$$\mathcal{L} = \{iQ(q) : q \in \mathbb{H}, \quad \Re(q) = 0\}.$$

Indeed, if $X_1 = iQ(q_1)$ and $X_2 = iQ(q_2)$, then $X_1\overline{X_2} = Q(q_1q_2)$. Hence, $aQ(q_1q_2) \in \mathcal{M}'$ for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ and any $\{q_1, q_2\} \subset \mathbb{H}$, such that $\Re(q_1) = \Re(q_2) = 0$. Then for any $\{q_1, q_2, q_3\} \subset \mathbb{H}$, such that $\Re(q_1) = \Re(q_2) = \Re(q_3) = 0$, we have $Z = aiQ(q_1q_2q_3) \in \mathcal{L}'$. We compute

$$Z + Z^* = i\Re(a)Q(h) + 2\Im(a)(q_1, q_2, q_3)\mathbf{I}_4,$$

where $h = q_1q_2q_3 + q_3q_2q_1$ and (q_1, q_2, q_3) is the triple-product of the 3D vectors corresponding to the imaginary quaternions q_1, q_2, q_3 . We observe that $\Re(h) = 0$, so that $i\Re(a)Q(h) \in \mathcal{L}$. Choosing $q_1 = i, q_2 = j$ and $q_3 = k$ we get $(q_1, q_2, q_3) = 1$, and therefore, $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M})$ is incomplete, since $\mathbf{I}_4 \notin \mathcal{L}$. In fact one easily verifies that the above calculation corresponds to the failure of a 3-chain relation in (2.4). In [9] it was shown that the 3-chain relation property is necessary for the $SO(2)$ -invariant Jordan multialgebra to correspond to an exact relation. Hence, the above Jordan multialgebra provides the first example of a rotationally invariant lamination exact relation in 2D that is not stable under homogenization.

References

- [1] A. A. Albert. On a certain algebra of quantum mechanics. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 35(1):65–73, Jan 1934.

- [2] A. Bensoussan, J. L. Lions, and G. Papanicolaou. *Asymptotic analysis of periodic structures*. North-Holland Publ., 1978.
- [3] Y. Benveniste. Exact results in the micromechanics of fibrous piezoelectric composites exhibiting pyroelectricity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 441:59–81, 1993.
- [4] Y. Benveniste. Exact connections between polycrystal and crystal properties in two-dimensional polycrystalline aggregates. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A*, 447:1–22, 1994.
- [5] M. L. Dunn. Exact relations between the thermoelectroelastic moduli of heterogeneous materials. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 441(1913):549–557, 1993.
- [6] G. J. Dvorak. On uniform fields in heterogeneous media. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 431(1881):89–110, 1990.
- [7] G. J. Dvorak. On some exact results in thermoplasticity of composite materials. *J. Thermal Stresses*, 15(2):211–228, 1992. Sixty-fifth Birthday of Bruno A. Boley Symposium, Part 2 (Atlanta, GA, 1991).
- [8] Y. Grabovsky. Exact relations for effective tensors of polycrystals. I: Necessary conditions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 143(4):309–330, 1998.
- [9] Y. Grabovsky. Algebra, geometry and computations of exact relations for effective moduli of composites. In G. Capriz and P. M. Mariano, editors, *Advances in Multifield Theories of Continua with Substructure*, Modeling and Simulation in Science, Engineering and Technology, pages 167–197. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2004.
- [10] Y. Grabovsky. Exact relations for effective conductivity of fiber-reinforced conducting composites with the Hall effect via a general theory. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 41(3):973–1024, 2009.
- [11] Y. Grabovsky, G. W. Milton, and D. S. Sage. Exact relations for effective tensors of polycrystals: Necessary conditions and sufficient conditions. *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.*, 53(3):300–353, 2000.
- [12] Z. Hashin. Thermal expansion of polycrystalline aggregates: I. Exact results. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 32:149–157, 1984.
- [13] M. Hegg. *Exact Relations And Links For Fiber-Reinforced Elastic Composites*. PhD thesis, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, May 2012.
- [14] R. Hill. Elastic properties of reinforced solids: Some theoretical principles. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 11:357–372, 1963.
- [15] N. Jacobson. *Structure and representations of Jordan algebras*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1968. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXXIX.

- [16] V. V. Jikov, S. M. Kozlov, and O. A. Oleĭnik. *Homogenization of differential operators and integral functionals*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. Translated from the Russian by G. A. Yosifian.
- [17] P. Jordan, J. v. Neumann, and E. Wigner. On an algebraic generalization of the quantum mechanical formalism. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 35(1):29–64, 1934.
- [18] J. B. Keller. A theorem on the conductivity of a composite medium. *J. Math. Phys.*, 5:548–549, 1964.
- [19] N. Kwon and D. S. Sage. Subrepresentation semirings and an analog of $6j$ -symbols. *J. Math. Phys.*, 49(6):063503, 21, 2008.
- [20] S. Lang. *Algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., third edition, 1993.
- [21] V. M. Levin. Thermal expansion coefficients of heterogeneous materials. *MTT*, 2(1):88–94, 1967.
- [22] M. Milgrom. Some more exact results concerning multifield moduli of two-phase composites. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 45(3):399–404, 1997.
- [23] M. Milgrom and S. Shtrikman. Linear response of polycrystals to coupled fields: Exact relations among the coefficients. *Physical Review B (Solid State)*, 40(9):5991–5994, 1989.
- [24] M. Milgrom and S. Shtrikman. Linear response of two-phase composites with cross moduli: Exact universal relations. *Physical Review A (Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics)*, 40(3):1568–1575, 1989.
- [25] G. W. Milton. On characterizing the set of possible effective tensors of composites: the variational method and the translation method. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 43:63–125, 1990.
- [26] G. W. Milton. Composites: A myriad of microstructure independent relations. In T. Tatsumi, E. Watanabe, and T. Kambe, editors, *Theoretical and applied mechanics (Proc. of the XIX International Congress of Theoretical and Applied mechanics, Kyoto, 1996)*, pages 443–459. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1997.
- [27] G. W. Milton. *The theory of composites*, volume 6 of *Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [28] B. W. Rosen and Z. Hashin. Effective thermal expansion coefficients and specific heats of composite materials. *Int. J. Engng. Sci.*, 8:157–173, 1970.
- [29] D. S. Sage. Group actions on central simple algebras. *J. Algebra*, 250:18–43, 2002.
- [30] D. S. Sage. Quantum Racah coefficients and subrepresentation semirings. *J. Lie Theory*, 15(1):321–333, 2005.

- [31] D. S. Sage. Racah coefficients, subrepresentation semirings, and composite materials. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 34(2):335–357, 2005.
- [32] K. Schulgasser. Thermal expansion of polycrystalline aggregates with texture. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids*, 35(1):34–42, 1987.
- [33] V. Šverák. Rank-one convexity does not imply quasiconvexity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 120(1-2):185–189, 1992.